arXiv:1603.09472v1 [math.PR] 31 Mar 2016

Asymptotic Optimal Tracking: Feedback Strategies

Jiatu Cai[1], Mathieu Rosenbaum[2] and Peter Tankov[1]

[1] Laboratoire de Probabilités et Modèles Aléatoires,
Université Paris Diderot (Paris 7)

[2] Laboratoire de Probabilités et Modèles Aléatoires,
Université Pierre et Marie Curie (Paris 6)

Abstract

This is a companion paper to [2]. We consider a class of strategies of feedback form for the problem of tracking and study their performance under the asymptotic framework of the above reference. The strategies depend only on the current state of the system and keep the deviation from the target inside a time-varying domain. Although the dynamics of the target is non-Markovian, it turns out that such strategies are asympototically optimal for a large list of examples.

Key words: Tracking problem, asymptotic optimality, feedback strategies

1 Introduction

We consider the problem of tracking a target whose dynamics (X_t°) is modeled by a continuous Itō semi-martingale defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$dX_t^\circ = b_t dt + \sqrt{a}_t dW_t, \quad X_0^\circ = 0.$$

Here, (W_t) is a d-dimensional Brownian motion and (b_t), (a_t) are predictable processes with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathcal{S}_+^d$, the set of $d \times d$ symmetric positive definite matrices, respectively. An agent observes X_t° and applies a control ψ_t to adjust her position Y_t^ψ in order to follow X_t°. The deviation from the target is denoted by $X_t = -X_t^\circ + Y_t^\psi$. The agent has to pay certain intervention costs for position adjustments and aims to minimize the functional

$$J(\psi) = H_0(X) + H(\psi), \tag{1.1}$$

where $H(\psi)$ is the cost functional depending on the type of control and H_0 is the deviation penalty

$$H_0(X) = \int_0^T r_t D(X_t) dt,$$

where (r_t) is a random weight process and $D(x)$ a deterministic function. In the small-cost asymptotic of [2] (recalled below), minimization of the functional (1.1) is possible in the pathwise sense.

The agent has at her disposal several types of control with associated cost functionals.

- With *impulse control* the position of the agent is given by

$$Y_t = \sum_{0<\tau_j\leq t} \xi_j$$

and the cost functional is

$$H(\psi) = \sum_{0<\tau_j\leq T} k_{\tau_j} F(\xi_j).$$

Here, $\{\tau_j, j \in \mathbb{N}^*\}$ is a strictly increasing sequence of stopping times representing the jump times and satisfying $\lim_{j\to\infty} \tau_j = +\infty$, for each $j \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\xi_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_j}$-measurable random vector representing the size of j-th jump, (k_t) is a random weight process and $F(\xi) > 0$ is the cost of a jump.

- With *singular control*, the position of the agent is given by

$$Y_t = \int_0^t \gamma_s d\varphi_s,$$

and the corresponding cost is

$$H(\psi) = \int_0^T h_t P(\gamma_t) d\varphi_t.$$

Here, φ is a progressively measurable increasing process with $\varphi_{0-} = 0$, which represents the cumulated amount of intervention, γ is a progressively measurable process with $\gamma_t \in \Delta := \{n \in \mathbb{R}^d | \sum_{i=1}^d |n^i| = 1\}$ for all $t \geq 0$, which represents the distribution of the control effort in each direction, (h_t) is a random weight process and $P(\cdot)$ determines the cost of applying the control in a given direction.

- With *regular control* the position of the agent is given by

$$Y_t = \int_0^t u_s ds,$$

and the cost functional is

$$H(\psi) = \int_0^T l_t Q(u_t) dt.$$

Here, u is a progressively measurable integrable process representing the speed of the agent, (l_t) is a random weight process and $Q(\cdot)$ is the running cost function.

Throughout this paper we assume that the cost functions D, Q, F, P verify the following homogeneity property

$$D(\varepsilon x) = \varepsilon^{\zeta_D} D(x), \quad Q(\varepsilon u) = \varepsilon^{\zeta_Q} Q(u), \quad F(\varepsilon \xi) = \varepsilon^{\zeta_F} F(\xi), \quad P(\varepsilon \xi) = \varepsilon^{\zeta_P} P(\xi),$$

with $\zeta_D > 0$, $\zeta_Q > 1$, $\zeta_F = 0$, $\zeta_P = 1$. For example, we could take

$$D(x) = x^T \Sigma^D x, \quad Q(u) = u^T \Sigma^Q u, \quad F(\xi) = \sum_{i=1}^d F_i \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi^i \neq 0\}}, \quad P(\xi) = \sum_{i=1}^d P_i |\xi^i|,$$

with $\min_i F_i > 0$ and $\Sigma^D, \Sigma^Q \in \mathcal{S}_+^d$ such that $\zeta_D = \zeta_Q = 2$. We refer to [2] for a more detailed description of the setting as well as for a review of literature on the tracking problem and on its applications to mathematical finance.

Finding optimal control policies for such systems, which have general non-Markovian dynamics and complex cost structures, is in general infeasible and may not even make sense in the pathwise setting. However, in [2] we were able to establish a lower bound for the best achievable asymptotic performance under a suitable asymptotic framework. We have shown that the lower bound is related to the time-average control of Brownian motion. It is then natural to try to construct tracking policies that are (near-)optimal by suitably adapting the solution of time-average control problem of Brownian motion. We will show that this is indeed possible when the latter is available. However, closed-form solutions of the time-average control of Brownian motion are rarely available, and computing numerical solutions may be costly. From a practical viewpoint, it is also often irrelevant to find *the* optimal strategy since there are already many approximations in the model.

The aim of this paper is therefore to introduce and study feedback strategies which are easy to implement in practice and whose asymptotic performance is close to the lower bound of [2]. Here, "feedback" means that the control decision is Markovian, depending only on the current state of the system.

We consider three control settings (combined regular and impulse control; combined regular and singular control; only regular control), and for each setting introduce a class of feedback strategies, and a corresponding small cost asymptotic framework, which allows to establish the convergence of the renormalized cost functional to a well-defined limit under suitable assumptions. Comparing this limit with the lower bound of [2], we can prove the asymptotic optimality of the feedback strategy in a variety of examples, and

quantify the "asymptotic suboptimality" in the situations when the asymptotic optimality does not hold.

Notation. We denote the graph of an application $M : E \to E'$ by M^g. Let (E, d) be a complete separable metric space. $\mathcal{M}(E)$ denotes the space of Borel measures on E equipped with weak topology and $\mathcal{P}(E)$ denotes the subspace of probability measures. The Hausdorff distance on the space of closed sets is given by

$$H(A, B) = \inf\{\delta, B \subseteq V_\delta(A) \text{ and } A \subseteq V_\delta(B)\},$$

where $V_\delta(\cdot)$ denotes the δ-neighborhood of a closed set, i.e. $V_\delta(A) = \{x \in E, d(x, A) \leq \delta\}$. We shall also sometimes need the standard notation from classical EDP theory: for a domain Ω, we denote by $C^{l+\alpha}(\Omega)$ the class of functions which are bounded and α-Hölder continuous on Ω together with their first l derivatives, and we say that the domain is of class $C^{l+\alpha}$ if its boundary may be defined (in local coordinates) by functions of class $C^{l+\alpha}$. See, e.g., [8] for precise definitions.

2 Combined regular and impulse control

In this section we focus on the case of combined regular and impulse control where the deviation (X_t) from the target is given by

$$X_t = -X_t^\circ + \int_0^t u_s ds + \sum_{j:0<\tau_j\leq t} \xi_j.$$

2.1 Feedback strategies

Motivated by various results in the literature and by the strategies used by traders in practice, we consider a class of *feedback strategies*. Under our asymptotic setting, an appropriate feedback strategy should depend on time. More precisely, let (G_t) be a time-dependent random open bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$, ξ_t be a time-dependent random function such that $x \mapsto x + \xi(x) \in C^0(\partial G_t, G_t)$, and (U_t) be a time-dependent bounded random function such that $U_t \in C^0(\overline{G}_t, \mathbb{R}^d)$. We say that the triplet (U_t, G_t, ξ_t) is continuous if $(U_t^g, \partial G_t, \xi_t^g)$ is continuous as closed set-valued processes w.r.t. the Hausdorff distance H and that (U_t, G_t, ξ_t) is progressively measurable, if $(U_t^g, \partial G_t, \xi_t^g)$ is progressively measurable w.r.t. $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ as closed set-valued processes (see [6] for more details).

In the sequel we will consider (U_t, G_t, ξ_t) which is continuous and progressively measurable. Intuitively, we require that the data (U_t, G_t, ξ_t) is determined in a non-anticipative way, based on information up to time t, and does not vary too much in time. Note that since ∂G_t is continuous, the topology of the domain G_t (number of holes, boundedness, etc.) remains the same.

Given a triplet (U_t, G_t, ξ_t), we consider a family of stopping times $(\tau_k)_{k\geq 0}$ and a family of processes $(\widehat{X}_t^{(k)})_{\tau_k\leq t\leq\tau_{k+1}}^{k\geq 0}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tau_0 = 0, \quad \tau_{k+1} = \inf\{t > \tau_k : \widehat{X}_t^{(k)} \notin G_t\} \quad \text{for} \quad k \geq 0,\\
&\widehat{X}_0^{(0)} = 0, \quad d\widehat{X}_t^{(k)} = -dX_t^\circ + U_t(\widehat{X}_t^{(k)})dt, \quad \widehat{X}_{\tau_{k+1}}^{(k+1)} = \widehat{X}_{\tau_{k+1}}^{(k)} + \xi_{\tau_{k+1}}(\widehat{X}_{\tau_{k+1}}^{(k)}) \quad \text{for} \quad k \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The existence of such processes will be discussed below. We now define the controlled deviation process by

$$X_t^{(U,G,\xi)} = \sum_{k\geq 0} \widehat{X}_t^{(k)} \mathbf{1}_{\tau_k\leq t<\tau_{k+1}}$$

and the corresponding boundary chain by

$$Y_j^{(U,G,\xi)} = \widehat{X}_{\tau_j}^{(j)}, \quad j \geq 1.$$

In other words, when the deviation X_t is inside the domain G_t, only the regular control is active and the tracker maintains a speed of $U_t(X_t)$. When X_{t-} touches the boundary ∂G_t at time τ, a jump of size $\xi_\tau(X_{\tau-})$ towards the interior of G_t takes place and the process X_t takes the value $X_{\tau-} + \xi(X_{\tau-})$ at time τ. We then have

$$X_t^{(U,G,\xi)} = -X_t^\circ + \int_0^t U_s(X_s^{(U,G,\xi)})ds + \sum_{0<\tau_j^{(U,G,\xi)}\leq t} \xi_{\tau_j}(Y_j^{(U,G,\xi)}). \tag{2.1}$$

and we define $u_t = U_t(X_t^{(U,G,\xi)})$ and $\xi_j = \xi_{\tau_j}(Y_j^{(U,G,\xi)})$.

Recall that the asymptotic framework introduced in [2] consists in considering the sequence of optimization problems indexed by $\varepsilon \to 0$ with optimization functionals

$$J^\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon, \tau^\varepsilon, \xi^\varepsilon) = \int_0^T (r_t D(X_t^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^{\beta_Q} l_t Q(u_t^\varepsilon))dt + \sum_{j:0<\tau_j^\varepsilon \le T} (\varepsilon^{\beta_F} k_{\tau_j^\varepsilon} F(\xi_j^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^{\beta_P} h_{\tau_j^\varepsilon} P(\xi_j^\varepsilon)), \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$X_t^\varepsilon = -X_t^\circ + \int_0^t u_s^\varepsilon ds + \sum_{j:0<\tau_j^\varepsilon \le t} \xi_j^\varepsilon,$$

and β_Q, β_F and β_P are real numbers such that

$$\frac{\beta_F}{\zeta_D + 2 - \zeta_F} = \frac{\beta_P}{\zeta_D + 2 - \zeta_P} = \frac{\beta_Q}{\zeta_D + \zeta_Q} = \beta$$

for some $\beta > 0$.

Given a triplet (U_t, G_t, ξ_t), we define $U_t^\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{-(\alpha-1)\beta} U_t(\varepsilon^{-\beta}x)$, $\xi_t^\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^\beta \xi_t(\varepsilon^{-\beta}x)$ and $G_t^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^\beta G_t$, and construct the sequence of controlled processes and feedback strategies $(X^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon, \tau^\varepsilon, \xi^\varepsilon)$ as in (2.1). We make the following assumption.

Assumption 2.1. *The controlled deviation process and the feedback strategy $(X^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon, \tau^\varepsilon, \xi^\varepsilon)$ exist and are unique for each $\varepsilon > 0$.*

A rigorous verification of the above definition requires detailed analysis with specific conditions on (U_t, G_t, ξ_t). We now describe a simple situation where the above assumption is verified.

Lemma 2.1. *Let (U_t) be locally Lipschitz, and assume that there exists a* potential function *V for the jump rule, i.e.*

$$|U_t(x) - U_t(y)| \le K_t|x - y|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall (t,\omega), \tag{2.3}$$
$$V(x + \xi_t(x)) - V(x) < 0, \quad \forall (t,\omega), \tag{2.4}$$

where K_t is locally bounded and $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$. Then Assumption 2.1 holds.

Proof. Modulo a localization procedure, we may assume that K_t, b_t and a_t are bounded and $V(x + \xi_t(x)) - V(x) < -\delta < 0$ for all (t,ω) and all $x \in \partial G_t$, where δ is a constant. Similarly, the function V as well as its first and second derivatives may be assumed to be bounded when their argument belongs to G_t.

For the existence of $\widehat{X}^{(k)}$ for each k (in the strong sense), Lipschitz-type regularity on U_t is sufficient (see [10, Chapter V] for more details). For the existence of X^ε on the whole horizon $[0, T]$, it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \tau_j^\varepsilon = +\infty$$

almost surely. By Itô's lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} V(X_{\tau_n^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) - V(0) = &\int_0^{\tau_n^\varepsilon} \Big\{(U(X_t^\varepsilon) - b_t)\nabla V(X_t^\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{ij} a_{ij,t}\partial_{ij}^2 V(X_t^\varepsilon)\Big\}dt \\ &- \int_0^{\tau_n^\varepsilon} \nabla V(X_t^\varepsilon)^T \sqrt{a_t} dW_t + \sum_{k=1}^n \{V(X_{\tau_k^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) - V(X_{\tau_k^\varepsilon -}^\varepsilon)\}, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\delta n \le C(1 + \tau_n^\varepsilon) + \int_0^{\tau_n^\varepsilon} \nabla V(X_t^\varepsilon)^T \sqrt{a_t} dW_t$$

for all $n \ge 1$, which is only possible if $\tau_n^\varepsilon \to +\infty$ a.s.

□

2.2 Asymptotic performance

In order to have well-behaved strategies, we restrict ourselves to the following class of admissible triplets (U_t, G_t, ξ_t).

Definition 2.1 (Admissible Strategy)**.** *The triplet (U_t, G_t, ξ_t) is said to be admissible if the following conditions hold true.*

1. *(Potential) There exists $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ such that (2.4) is satisfied.*
2. *(Separability) For any (t, ω), let $U = U_t^\omega$, $G = G_t^\omega$ and $\xi = \xi_t^\omega$. Then there exists a unique couple $(\pi, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}(\overline{G}) \times \mathcal{M}(\partial G)$ verifying the constraints*

$$\int_{\overline{G}} A_U^a f(x,u)\pi(dx) + \int_{\partial G} B_\xi f(x)\nu(dx) = 0, \quad \forall f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$A_U^a f(x) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j} a_{ij}\partial_{ij}^2 f(x) + U(x)\cdot\nabla f(x), \quad B_\xi f(x) = f(x+\xi(x)) - f(x).$$

We note $\pi =: \pi^{(a,U,G,\xi)}$ and $\nu =: \nu^{(a,U,G,\xi)}$ to indicate the dependence on (a, U, G, ξ).

The separability assumption is related to the existence and uniqueness of a stationary distribution for the diffusion with jumps from the boundary. The following lemma gives an example of the situation where this assumption holds.

Lemma 2.2. *Let (a_{ij}) be positive definite, let G be a connected bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^d$ of class $C^{2+\alpha}$ for some $\alpha > 0$, let U be Lipschitz and let $\xi : \partial G \to G$ be continuous. Assume that there exists a function $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that (2.4) is satisfied. Then there exists a unique couple $(\pi, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}(\overline{G}) \times \mathcal{M}(\partial G)$ verifying the constraints (2.5).*

Proof. Let $\overline{X}$ denote the controlled deviation process with dynamics

$$d\overline{X}_t = \sqrt{a}dW_t + U(\overline{X}_t)dt, \tag{2.6}$$

on G and jumps from the boundary ∂G defined by the mapping ξ. This process is defined in the same way as (2.1). We also denote by $(\bar{\tau}_j)_{j\geq 1}$ the corresponding jump times and by $(\overline{Y}_j)_{j\geq 1}$ the corresponding boundary chain. By continuity, we may assume that $V(x+\xi(x)) - V(x) < -\delta < 0$ for all $x \in \partial G$, where δ is a constant.

For measurable subsets $\mathcal{A} \subset \overline{G}$, $\mathcal{B} \subset \partial G$, define, for all $t > 0$,

$$\pi_t(\mathcal{A}) = \frac{1}{t}\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{X}_s)ds\Big], \qquad \nu_t(\mathcal{B}) = \frac{1}{t}\mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{j=1}^{N_t}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}}(\overline{X}_{\bar{\tau}_j-})\Big],$$

where $N_t = \sum_{j\geq 1}\mathbf{1}_{\bar{\tau}_j \leq t}$. By Itô's lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} V(\overline{X}_t) - V(0) = &\int_0^t \Big\{U(\overline{X}_s)\nabla V(\overline{X}_s) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{ij} a_{ij}\partial_{ij}^2 V(\overline{X}_s)\Big\}ds \\ &- \int_0^t \nabla V(\overline{X}_s)^T\sqrt{a}dW_s + \sum_{k=1}^{N_t}\{V(\overline{X}_{\bar{\tau}_k}) - V(\overline{X}_{\bar{\tau}_k-})\}, \end{aligned}$$

so that there exists a constant $C < \infty$ such that

$$\delta N_t \leq C(1+t) + \int_0^t \nabla V(\overline{X}_s)^T\sqrt{a}dW_s \quad \text{and} \quad \delta\mathbb{E}N_t \leq C(1+t),$$

which shows that (ν_t) is tight. On the other hand, (π_t) is tight as a family of probability measures on a bounded set. Therefore, there exist measures $\pi^* \in \mathcal{P}(\overline{G})$ and $\nu^* \in \mathcal{M}(\partial G)$ and a sequence $(t_n)_{n\geq 1}$ converging to infinity such that $\nu_{t_n} \to \nu^*$ and $\pi_{t_n} \to \pi^*$ weakly as $n \to \infty$.

Let $f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. By Itô's lemma, for every $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\overline{X}_{t_n})] = \mathbb{E}[f(\overline{X}_0)] - t_n \int_{\overline{G}} A_U^a f(x)\pi_{t_n}(dx) - t_n \int_{\partial G} B_\xi f(x)\nu_{t_n}(dx).$$

Dividing by t_n on both sides and making n tend to infinity, we conclude that

$$\int_{\overline{G}} A_U^a f(x)\pi^*(dx) + \int_{\partial G} Bf(x)\nu^*(dx) = 0,$$

which proves existence of the couple (π, ν) satisfying (2.5).

Let us now show that this couple is unique. By classical results on elliptic equations (see e.g., [8, chapter 3]), for every $g \in C^{2+\alpha}(\partial G)$, there exists a unique solution $F^g \in C^{2+\alpha}(\overline{G})$ of the equation $A_U^a F^g = 0$ on $\overline{G}$ with the boundary condition $F^g = g$ on ∂G, which may be extended to a $C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ function. Moreover, this solution may be represented as follows:

$$F^g(x) = \mathbb{E}^x[g(\overline{X}_{\tau_1-})],$$

where $\mathbb{E}^x$ denotes the expectation with initial value $x \in G$. Substituting the function F^g into (2.5), we obtain

$$\int_{\partial G} g(x)\nu(dx) = \int_{\partial G} F^g(x + \xi(x))\nu(dx). \tag{2.7}$$

Denote the transition kernel of the chain $(\overline{Y}_n)$ by $p(x, dy)$. Then,

$$F^g(x + \xi(x)) = \mathbb{E}[g(\overline{Y}_{n+1})|\overline{Y}_n = x] = \int_{\partial G} g(y)p(x, dy).$$

Therefore, equation (2.7) (satisfied for all g) is equivalent to

$$\nu(dx) = \int_{\partial G} \nu(dy)p(y, dx),$$

which means that ν is uniquely defined up to a multiplicative constant if and only if the Markov chain $(\overline{Y}_k)$ is ergodic.

Let $G' \subset\subset G$ be a connected open domain such that $x + \xi(x) \in G'$ for all $x \in \partial G$ (such a domain exists since ξ is continuous and ∂G is closed) and choose $x_0 \in G'$. Then, for a Borel subset $A \subset \partial G$, by Harnack's inequality,

$$\max_{x\in\partial G} \int_A p(x, dy) = \max_{x\in\partial G} \mathbb{P}[\overline{X}^{x+\xi(x)}_{\tau_1-} \in A] \leq \max_{x\in G'} \mathbb{P}[\overline{X}^{x}_{\tau_1-} \in A] \leq C\mathbb{P}[\overline{X}^{x_0}_{\tau_1-} \in A],$$

for a constant $C < \infty$ which does not depend on A. Therefore, the Markov chain (Y_k) satisfies Doeblin's condition (see e.g., [13]), which implies ergodicity. This shows the uniqueness of the measure ν up to a multiplicative constant. To show that ν is unique, consider now a function $f \in C_0^2$ such that $A_U^a f = 1$ on $\overline{G}$.

Finally, to show the uniqueness of π, one can choose a function f to be the unique solution in $C^{2+\alpha}(\overline{G})$ of the equation $A_U^a f = g$, where g is an arbitrary function in $C^\alpha(\overline{G})$.

□

Example 2.1. *Let A_t be a continuous adapted process with values in $\mathcal{S}_+^d$, and let a_t be a continuous adapted process taking values in $[0, 1)$. Define $G_t = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x^T A_t x < 1\}$ and $\xi_t(x) = (1 - \alpha_t)x$. Then, condition (2.4) is satisfied with $V(x) = \|x\|^2$.*

Now we state the first main result in this paper.

Theorem 2.1 (Asymptotic performance for combined regular and impulse control)**.** *Consider an admissible triplet (U_t, G_t, ξ_t), suppose that Assumption 2.1 is satisfied and let $(X^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon, \tau^\varepsilon, \xi^\varepsilon)$ be the corresponding feedback strategy. Then,*

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{\zeta_D \beta}} J^\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon, \tau^\varepsilon, \xi^\varepsilon) \to_p \int_0^T c(a_t, U_t, G_t, \xi_t; r_t, l_t, k_t, h_t)dt,$$

where $c(a,U,G,\xi;r,l,k,h)$ *is given by*

$$c(a,U,G,\xi;r,l,k,h)=\int_{\overline{G}}[rD(x)+lQ(U(x))]\pi^{(a,U,G,\xi)}(dx)\\ +\int_{\partial G}[kF(\xi(x))+hP(\xi(x))]\nu^{(a,U,G,\xi)}(dx).$$

Moreover, the convergence holds term by term for the cost functions D, Q, F, P *respectively.*

Remark 2.1. *In [2] we have established that for any sequence of admissible strategies* $(u^\varepsilon,\tau^\varepsilon,\xi^\varepsilon)$,

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{\zeta_D\beta}}J^\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon,\tau^\varepsilon,\xi^\varepsilon)\geq_p\int_0^T I(a_t,r_t,l_t,k_t,h_t)dt \tag{2.8}$$

where $I=I(a,r,l,k,h)$ *is given by*

$$I=\inf_{(\mu,\rho)}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d}(rD(x)+lQ(u))\mu(dx\times du)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d}(kF(\xi)+hP(\xi))\rho(dx\times d\xi), \tag{2.9}$$

with $(\mu,\rho)\in\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d)\times\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ *verifying the following constraints*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d}A^af(x,u)\mu(dx\times du)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d}Bf(x,\xi)\rho(dx\times d\xi)=0,\quad\forall f\in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

where

$$A^af(x,u)=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j}a_{ij}\partial^2_{ij}f(x)+u\cdot f(x),\qquad Bf(x,\xi)=f(x+\xi)-f(x).$$

If we can find (U_t,G_t,ξ_t) *such that* $c(a_t,U_t,G_t,\xi_t;r_t;l_t,k_t,h_t)=I(a_t,r_t,l_t,k_t,h_t)$ *for all* t, *then the lower bound of [2] is sharp and we say that the feedback strategy* (U_t,G_t,ξ_t) *is* asymptotically optimal. *In particular, in the one-dimensional case, when* $D(x)=x^2$, $Q(u)=u^2$, $F(\xi)=1$ *and* $P(\xi)=|\xi|$, *the lower bounds found in Examples 4.5 and 4.6 of [2] correspond to strategies of feedback form, which means that these bounds are sharp and the asymptotically optimal strategies are explicit.*

Example 2.2. *In this example we revisit the problem of optimal tracking in the multidimensional setting with fixed costs. A very similar problem was studied in [5], in the context of optimal rebalancing of hedging portfolios, and an asymptotically optimal strategy based on hitting times of ellipsoids has been found.*

Let $D(x)=x^T\Sigma^Dx$, $l=0$, $F(\xi)\equiv 1$ *and* $P(\xi)\equiv 0$. *Without loss of generality we set* $r=1$ *and* $k=1$. *The cost functional of the linear programming problem becomes,*

$$I=\inf_{(\mu,\rho)}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}x^T\Sigma^Dx\,\mu(dx)+\rho(\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d),$$

where μ *is now a probability measure on* $\mathbb{R}^d$ *only, since there is no regular control. By Lemma 3.1 in [5], the matrix equation*

$$2(a^{1/2}Ba^{1/2})^2+a^{1/2}Ba^{1/2}\operatorname{Tr}(a^{1/2}Ba^{1/2})=2a^{1/2}\Sigma^Da^{1/2} \tag{2.10}$$

admits a unique solution $B\in\mathcal{S}_+^d$. *We define*

$$w(x)=\begin{cases}x^TBx-\dfrac{(x^TBx)^2}{4}, & x^TBx<2\\ 1, & x^TBx\geq 2.\end{cases}$$

Clearly, $w\in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)\cap C^2(\mathbb{R}^d\setminus N)$, *where* $N=\{x:x^TBx=2\}$. *Note also that*

$$\frac{1}{2}\sum_{ij}a_{ij}\partial^2_{ij}w(x)=\begin{cases}\operatorname{Tr}(aB)\Big(1-\dfrac{x^TBx}{2}\Big)-x^TBaBx, & x^TBx<2\\ 0, & x^TBx>2\end{cases} \tag{2.11}$$

We are going to apply Lemma 8.1 of [2] to compute a lower bound for I. Property 2 of Lemma 8.1, is a straightforward consequence of (2.11). Property 3 of this lemma is also easily deduced from (2.11), with $I^V = Tr(aB)$. It remains to check Property 1, which requires that $\mu(N) = 0$ for all (μ, ρ) with $\int x^T \Sigma^D x \, \mu(dx) < \infty$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d_x} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} a_{ij} \partial^2_{ij} f(x) \mu(dx) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d_x \times \mathbb{R}^d_\xi} (f(x+\xi) - f(x)) \rho(dx, d\xi) = 0, \quad f \in C^2_0(\mathbb{R}^d). \tag{2.12}$$

Assume that this is not the case. For $\delta \in (0,1)$ let $\phi_\delta : \mathbb{R}^d \to [0,1]$ be defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\phi_\delta = 0, && x^T Bx < 2 - 2\delta \\
&\phi_\delta = (x^T Bx - 2 + 2\delta)/\delta, && 2 - 2\delta \le x^T Bx < 2 - \delta \\
&\phi_\delta = 1, && 2 - \delta \le x^T Bx < 2 + \delta \\
&\phi_\delta = (2 + 2\delta - x^T Bx)/\delta, && 2 + \delta \le x^T Bx < 2 + 2\delta \\
&\phi_\delta = 0, && 2 + 2\delta \le x^T Bx.
\end{aligned}$$

Let f_δ be the extension to $C^2_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of the solution of

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} a_{ij} \partial^2_{ij} f_\delta(x) = \phi_\delta(x), \quad x^T Bx \le 4$$

with boundary condition $f_\delta(x) = 0$ for $x^T Bx = 4$. By Feynmann-Kac formula,

$$f_\delta(x) = \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\tau \phi_\delta(\Xi^x_s) ds \Big],$$

where Ξ^x is defined by.

$$\Xi^x_t = x + \int_0^t \sqrt{a} dW_s,$$

and $\tau = \inf\{t > 0 : (\Xi^x_t)^T B \, \Xi^x_t = 4\}$. By the dominated convergence theorem, $f_\delta(x) \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$ for all x with $x^T Bx \le 4$, and also uniformly on x. On the other hand,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d_x} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} a_{ij} \partial^2_{ij} f_\delta(x) \mu(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d_x} \phi_\delta(x) \mu(dx) \ge \mu(N),$$

which yields a contradiction with (2.12). Finally, Lemma 8.1 of [2] may be applied and yields that $I \ge Tr(aB)$.
Now consider $G := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x^T Bx < 2\}$ and $\xi(x) = -x$. Since there is no regular control, we let $U(x) = 0$ and omit this variable as well as the variables l and h below, and we also set $r = 1$ and $k = 1$ as above. Then,

$$c(a, G, \xi) = \int_{\overline{G}} D(x) \pi^{(a,G,\xi)}(dx) + \nu^{(a,G,\xi)}(\partial G),$$

where the measures $\pi^{(a,G,\xi)}$ and $\nu^{(a,G,\xi)}$ are uniquely defined by Lemma 2.2. Since the measure $\pi^{(a,G,\xi)}$ does not charge the set N, we may show by an approximation argument that

$$\int_G A^a w(x) \pi^{(a,G,\xi)}(dx) + \int_{\partial G} B_\xi w(x) \nu^{(a,G,\xi)}(dx) = 0.$$

Substituting the expressions of A^a and B_ξ, and using (2.11), we finally obtain

$$\int_G x^T \Sigma^D x \, \pi^{(a,G,\xi)}(dx) + \nu^{(a,G,\xi)}(\partial G) = Tr(aB).$$

To summarize, we have established that for the cost functional of the form

$$J^\varepsilon(\tau^\varepsilon, \xi^\varepsilon) = \int_0^T r_t \, (X^\varepsilon_t)^T \Sigma^D X^\varepsilon_t \, dt + \varepsilon \sum_{j : 0 < \tau^\varepsilon_j \le T} k_{\tau^\varepsilon_j},$$

and for any admissible control strategy $(\tau^\varepsilon, \xi^\varepsilon)$*, we have a lower bound*

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \varepsilon^{-1/2} J^\varepsilon(\tau^\varepsilon, \xi^\varepsilon) \geq_p \int_0^T I(a_t, r_t, k_t)dt,$$

where

$$I(a_t, r_t, k_t) = Tr(a_t B_t)\sqrt{r_t k_t},$$

where B_t *is the solution of Equation (2.10) with matrix* a_t*. This lower bound is sharp and may be attained by a feedback strategy based on hitting times of the time-varying domain* $G_t = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x^T B_t x < 2\sqrt{\frac{k_t}{r_t}}\}$*. Note that unlike the asymptotically optimal strategy found in [5], the domain is not fixed between the consecutive hitting times.*

3 Extensions to other types of control

3.1 Combined regular and singular control

In the absence of fixed cost component, we consider a family of strategies $(u^\varepsilon, \gamma^\varepsilon, \varphi^\varepsilon)$ with u^ε a progressively measurable process, $\gamma_t^\varepsilon \in \Delta = \{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^d | \sum_i |\gamma^i| = 1\}$ and φ_t^ε non-decreasing such that

$$X_t^\varepsilon = -X_t^\circ + \int_0^t u_s^\varepsilon ds + \int_0^t \gamma_s^\varepsilon d\varphi_s^\varepsilon.$$

The associated cost functional is given by

$$J^\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon, \gamma^\varepsilon, \varphi^\varepsilon) = \int_0^T (r_t D(X_t^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon^{\beta_Q} l_t Q(u_t^\varepsilon))dt + \int_0^T \varepsilon^{\beta_P} h_t P(\gamma_t^\varepsilon)d\varphi_t^\varepsilon.$$

The corresponding class of feedback strategies will involve continuous controls of local-time type. More precisely, let G_t be a moving domain with piecewise C^2 boundary and U_t a continuous function defined on $\overline{G}_t$ as before, let Γ_t be a set-valued mapping defined on ∂G_t with *closed graph* such that $\Gamma_t(x)$ is a non-empty closed convex cone in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with vertex at the origin 0 for each $x \in \partial G_t$. Usually $\Gamma_t(x)$ contains only a single direction on the smooth part of ∂G. If ∂G is C^2 then $\Gamma_t(x)$ can also be expressed in terms of a vector field on ∂G. *We assume that the triplet* (U_t, G_t, Γ_t) *is continuous and progressively measurable.*

The feedback strategy $(X^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon, \gamma^\varepsilon, \varphi^\varepsilon)$ based on (U_t, G_t, Γ_t) is defined by

$$X_t^\varepsilon = -X_t^\circ + \int_0^t u_s^\varepsilon ds + \int_0^t \gamma_s^\varepsilon d\varphi_s^\varepsilon,$$

with $\gamma_t^\varepsilon \in \Gamma_t$, φ^ε *continuous* non decreasing and

$$u_t^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-(\alpha-1)\beta} U_t(\varepsilon^{-\beta} X_t^\varepsilon),$$

such that

1. $\varepsilon^{-\beta} X_t^\varepsilon \in \overline{G}_t$,
2. $\gamma_t^\varepsilon \in \Gamma_t(X_t^\varepsilon) \cap \Delta$, $d\varphi_t$-almost surely,
3. $\int_0^T \mathbb{1}_{G_t}(\varepsilon^{-\beta} X_t^\varepsilon)d\varphi_t^\varepsilon = 0$.

Note that the condition $\gamma_t^\varepsilon \in \Delta$ allows γ_t^ε and φ_t^ε to be uniquely defined. We assume once again existence of the strategy.

Assumption 3.1. *The feedback strategy* $(X^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon, \gamma^\varepsilon, \varphi^\varepsilon)$ *exists and is unique for each* $\varepsilon > 0$*.*

The existence of such strategies is closely related to the Skorohod oblique reflection problem in time-dependent domains. While it is easy to establish in dimension one (see [11]), it is not at all trivial in higher dimension. We refer to [9] for precise sufficient conditions for the existence of such strategy.

From now on, we restrict ourselves to (U_t, G_t, Γ_t) for which the above strategies exist and are well-behaved.

Definition 3.1 (Admissible Strategy)**.** *The triplet (U_t, G_t, Γ_t) is admissible if the following conditions hold.*

1. *(Potential.) There exists $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\forall (t,\omega)$,*

$$\langle \nabla V(x), \gamma \rangle < 0, \quad \forall x \in \partial G_t^\omega, \gamma \in \Gamma_t^\omega(x). \tag{3.1}$$

We say that V is a potential function for (G_t, Γ_t).

2. *(Separability.) For any (t,ω), let $U = U_t^\omega, G = G_t^\omega$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma_t^\omega$, then there exists a unique couple $(\pi, \rho) \in \mathcal{P}(\overline{G}) \times \mathcal{M}(\Gamma_\Delta^g)$ such that*

$$\int_{\overline{G}} A_U^a f(x)\pi(dx) + \int_{\Gamma_\Delta^g} Bf(x,\gamma)\rho(dx, d\gamma) = 0, \quad \forall f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d), \tag{3.2}$$

where $\Gamma_\Delta^g = \{(x,\gamma) | x \in \partial G, \gamma \in \Delta \cap \Gamma(x)\}$ and

$$A_U^a f(x) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{ij} a_{ij}\partial_{ij}^2 f(x) + U(x)\cdot\nabla f(x), \quad Bf(x,\gamma) = \gamma \cdot \nabla f(x).$$

We note $\pi =: \pi^{(a,U,G,\Gamma)}$ and $\rho =: \rho^{(a,U,G,\Gamma)}$.

The following lemma clarifies the meaning of the measures π and ρ and provides an example of a situation where the separability assumption holds. For simplicity, we consider a smooth boundary and place ourselves in the classical setting of Stroock and Varadhan [12].

Lemma 3.1. *Let G be a connected bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let (a_{ij}) be positive definite, $u : G \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded and measurable, and $\gamma : \partial G \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be bounded and continuous. Assume that there exists a function $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $G = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : V(x) < 0\}$ and $\gamma(x)\cdot\nabla V(x) < 0$ for all $x \in \partial G$. Define $\Gamma(x) = \{s\gamma(x), s \geq 0\}$. Then there exists a unique couple $(\pi, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}(\overline{G}) \times \mathcal{M}(\partial G)$ verifying the constraints (3.2).*

Proof. Throughout the proof we shall assume with no loss of generality that $|\nabla V(x)| > 1$ and $\gamma(x)\cdot\nabla V(x) < -\beta < 0$ for some $\beta > 0$ for $x \in \partial G$, and that V, as well as its first and second derivative are bounded. Also, under our assumptions, condition (3.2) becomes

$$\int_{\overline{G}} A_U^a f(x)\pi(dx) + \int_{\partial G} Bf(x)\rho(dx) = 0, \quad \forall f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

with $Bf(x) = \gamma(x)\cdot\nabla f(x)$.

Let $(\mathbb{P}, X)$ be a solution to the submartingale problem with coefficients a, U and γ (see Theorem 3.1 in [12]), and let ξ be the associated non-decreasing process which increases only on the boundary ∂G. For measurable subsets $\mathcal{A} \subset \overline{G}$, $\mathcal{B} \subset \partial G$, define, for all $t > 0$,

$$\pi_t(\mathcal{A}) = \frac{1}{t}\mathbb{E}\int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(X_s)ds, \qquad \rho_t(\mathcal{B}) = \frac{1}{t}\mathbb{E}\int_0^t \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}}(X_s)d\xi_s.$$

By Theorem 2.5 in [12],

$$V(X_t) - \int_0^t \mathbf{1}_G(X_s)A_U^a V(X_s)ds - \int_0^t \nabla V \cdot \gamma d\xi_s$$

is a martingale. Taking the expectation yields

$$\mathbb{E}[V(X_t)] = \mathbb{E}[V(X_0)] - t\int_{\overline{G}} \mathbf{1}_G(x)A_U^a V(x)\pi_t(dx) - t\int_{\partial G} \nabla V(x)\cdot\gamma(x)\rho_t(dx).$$

Using the boundedness of U, V and the derivatives of V, and the condition that $\gamma(x)\cdot\nabla V(x) < -\beta$ we conclude that

$$\rho_t(\partial G) \leq C$$

for some constant $C < \infty$ which does not depend on t, which shows that (ρ_t) is tight. By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 2.2, using Theorems 2.4 and 2.5 in [12], we conclude that there exists

a couple (π, ρ) satisfying (3.2).

Let us now prove that the couple (π, ρ) satisfying (3.2) is unique. Choose one such couple (π, ρ). By Theorem 1.7 in [7], there exists a process X and a random measure Γ with $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma(\cdot \times [0,t])] = t\rho(\cdot)$, such that X is stationary and has distribution π, and for each $f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$f(X_t) - \int_0^t A_U^a f(X_s)ds - \int_{\overline{G}\times[0,t]} Bf(x)\Gamma(dx \times ds)$$

is a martingale. Moreover, from the discussion in section 2 of [7] we deduce that Γ is a positive measure, and hence that it is supported by $\partial G \times [0, \infty)$.

Taking $f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $\gamma(x) \cdot \nabla f(x) \geq 0$ for $x \in \partial G$, we see that X is a stationary solution of the submartingale problem (in the sense of [12]), which means that π is necessarily an invariant measure of reflected diffusion process in G. Since the generator of X is strictly elliptic, and the domain G is bounded, the invariant measure is unique[1] (see [4, pp. 97-98]), proving the uniqueness of π.

It remains to show the uniqueness of ρ, or in other words to prove that a signed measure ρ satisfying

$$\int_{\partial G} \gamma(x) \cdot \nabla f(x)\rho(dx) = 0, \quad \forall f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

is necessarily null. To this end, choose $f(x) = \alpha(x)V(x)$, with $\alpha \in C_0^2$. Then, $\nabla(\alpha V) = V\nabla\alpha + \alpha\nabla V = \alpha\nabla V$ on ∂G. Therefore,

$$0 = \int_{\partial G} \alpha(x)\gamma(x) \cdot \nabla V(x)\rho(dx),$$

which shows that $\rho(x) = 0$ since $\gamma(x) \cdot \nabla V(x) < -\beta < 0$ and α is arbitrary.

□

Example 3.1. *Let A_t be a continuous adapted process with values in $\mathcal{S}_+^d$, the set of symmetric positive definite matrices, define $G_t = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x^T A_t x < 1\}$ and let $\gamma(x) = -x$. Then, assumptions of Lemma 3.1 are satisfied with $V(x) = x^T A_t x - 1$ and (3.1) holds with $V(x) = \|x\|^2$.*

Now we are ready to state another main result.

Theorem 3.1 (Asymptotic performance for combined regular and singular control)**.** *Let (U_t, G_t, Γ_t) be an admissible triplet and let Assumption 3.1 be satisfied. Then,*

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{\zeta_D \beta}} J^\varepsilon(u^\varepsilon, \gamma^\varepsilon, \varphi^\varepsilon) \to_p \int_0^T c(a_t, U_t, G_t, \Gamma_t; r_t, l_t, h_t)dt,$$

where $c(a, u, G, \Gamma; r, l, h)$ is given by

$$c(a, u, G, \Gamma; r, l, h) = \int_{\overline{G}} (rD(x) + lQ(u(x)))\pi^{(a,u,G,\Gamma)}(dx) + \int_{\Gamma_\Delta^g} hP(\gamma)\rho^{(a,u,G,\Gamma)}(dx \times d\gamma).$$

Moreover, the convergence holds term by term for the cost functions D, Q and P respectively.

Remark 3.1. *In [2] we have established a lower bound of J^ε of the form (2.8) with function $I = I(a, r, l, h)$ given by*

$$I = \inf_{(\mu,\rho)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (rD(x) + lQ(u))\mu(dx \times du) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \Delta \times \mathbb{R}_\delta^+} hP(\gamma)\rho(dx \times d\gamma \times d\delta), \tag{3.3}$$

with $(\mu, \rho) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \Delta \times \mathbb{R}_\delta^+)$ verifying the following constraints

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} A^a f(x, u)\mu(dx \times du) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \Delta \times \mathbb{R}_\delta^+} Bf(x, \gamma, \delta)\rho(dx \times d\gamma \times d\delta) = 0, \quad \forall f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

[1] We thank Emmanuel Gobet for pointing out this reference.

where

$$Bf(x,\gamma,\delta) = \begin{cases} \langle \gamma, \nabla f(x) \rangle, & \delta = 0, \\ \delta^{-1}(f(x+\delta\gamma) - f(x)), & \delta > 0. \end{cases}$$

Once again, in the one-dimensional case, when $D(x) = x^2$, $Q(u) = u^2$ and $P(\xi) = |\xi|$, the lower bounds found in Examples 4.4 and 4.7 of [2] correspond to strategies of feedback form, which means that these bounds are sharp and the asymptotically optimal strategies are explicit.

3.2 The case when only one control is present

The situations with singular or impulse control only are included in the previous results. Only the case with regular control needs to be treated separately since the domain in which the process X evolves is now unbounded.

Let $U_t : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous predictable random function. The feedback strategy $(X_t^\varepsilon, u_t^\varepsilon)$ based on the Markov control policy U_t is given by

$$X_t^\varepsilon = -X_t^\circ + u_t^\varepsilon dt, \quad u_t^\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-\beta} U_t(\varepsilon^{-\beta} X_t^\varepsilon).$$

We assume that U_t, satisfies suitable conditions so that the process $(X^\varepsilon, u^\varepsilon)$ exists and is unique for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

To study the asymptotic behavior of the controlled process X^ε, we consider the following class of admissible strategies.

Definition 3.2 (Admissible strategy)**.** *The feedback control (U_t) is admissible if the following conditions are satisfied.*

1. *(Potential.) For each (t,ω), $U_t^\omega : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is locally bounded and there exists a non-negative, inf-compact Lyapunov function $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that*

$$A_{U_t}^{a_t} V(x) \le \theta_t - 2\Theta_t V(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_x,$$

with θ_t, Θ_t positive processes. Moreover, $rD + lQ \circ U_t^\omega$ are dominated by V near infinity, i.e. there exist locally bounded positive processes R_t and b_t such that

$$rD(x) + lQ \circ u_t^\omega(x) \le b_t^\omega V(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(x, R_t^\omega).$$

2. *(Separability.) For each (t,ω), there exists a unique $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} A_U^a f(x) \pi(dx) = 0, \quad \forall f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

We will denote $\pi = \pi^{(a,U)}$.

Remark 3.2. *Here π is the unique invariant measure of $dX_t = \sqrt{a} dW_t + U(X_t)dt$ under the feedback control U.*

Example 3.2. *Assume that D and Q are quadratic. Let $U_t(x) = -\Sigma_t x$ with Σ_t a continuous process with values in $\mathcal{S}_+^d$. Then (U_t) is an admissible Markov policy. To see this, it suffices to take $V(x) = x^T x$. The separability of π is equivalent to the ergodicity of $dX_t = \sqrt{a} dW_t - \Sigma X_t dt$.*

In dimension one, let $D(x) = x^2$, $Q(u) = u^2$, then we have

$$\pi(dx) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}} dx, \quad \sigma^2 = \frac{a}{2\Sigma}.$$

Below is our third main result.

Theorem 3.2 (Asymptotic performance for regular control)**.** *Let (u_t^ε) be the feedback strategy based on the admissible Markov control policy U_t, then,*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{\zeta_D \beta}} J^\varepsilon \to_p \int_0^T c(a_t, U_t; r_t, l_t) dt,$$

where $c(a,u;r,l)$ is given by

$$c(a,u;r,l)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(rD(x)+lQ\circ u(x))\pi(dx),$$

with $\pi=\pi^{(a,u)}$.

Remark 3.3. *In this case as well, we have a lower bound of the form (2.8) with the function I given by*

$$I(a,r,l)=\inf_{\mu}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d_x\times\mathbb{R}^d_u}(rD(x)+lQ(u))\mu(dx\times du)$$

with $\mu\in\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d_x\times\mathbb{R}^d_u)$ satisfying the constraint

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d_x\times\mathbb{R}^d_u}A^a f(x,u)\mu(dx\times du)=0\quad\forall f\in C^2_0(\mathbb{R}^d_x).$$

This shows that the bound given in Example 4.3 of [2] for the one-dimensional case with $D(x)=x^2$ and $Q(u)=u^2$ is sharp. Moreover, it can be generalized to the multidimensional case as follows.

Let $D(x)=x^TDx$ and $Q(u)=u^TQu$, with $D,Q\in\mathcal{S}^+_d$, and consider the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation

$$\inf_u\left\{\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^d a_{ij}\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial x_i\partial x_j}+u^T\nabla w+lQ(u)+rD(x)-I^V\right\}=0,$$

where I^V is a constant which must be found as part of the solution. It is easy to check that this equation admits an explicit solution

$$w(x)=x^TGx\quad\text{with}\quad G=\sqrt{rlQD},\quad I^V=\frac{1}{2}Tr(aG),$$

which corresponds to the feedback control

$$u(x)=-\sqrt{\frac{r}{l}Q^{-1}D}x.$$

We then deduce that for any $\mu\in\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d_x\times\mathbb{R}^d_u)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d_x\times\mathbb{R}^d_u}(rD(x)+lQ(u))\mu(dx\times du)\geq I^V-\int_{\mathbb{R}^d_x\times\mathbb{R}^d_u}A^a w(x,u)\mu(dx\times du).\tag{3.4}$$

Since it is enough to consider measures μ for which

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d_x\times\mathbb{R}^d_u}(rD(x)+lQ(u))\mu(dx\times du)<\infty,$$

we can approximate the function w with a sequence of functions in $C^2_0(\mathbb{R}^d_x)$ and show that the integrals in the right-hand side of (3.4) converge, proving that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d_x\times\mathbb{R}^d_u}(rD(x)+lQ(u))\mu(dx\times du)\geq I^V.$$

Now it remains to check that using the feedback strategy of example 3.2 with $\Sigma=\sqrt{\frac{r}{l}Q^{-1}D}$ we have exactly $c(a,U;r,l)=I^V$, which shows that this strategy is asymptotically optimal and the lower bound is sharp.

4 Proofs

Proof of Theorem 2.1 Let $\varepsilon\mapsto T^\varepsilon$ be a positive decreasing function such that $T^\varepsilon\to+\infty$ and $\varepsilon^2T^\varepsilon\to 0$ as $\varepsilon\to 0$, and consider following the rescaling of X^ε over the horizon $(t,t+\varepsilon^2T^\varepsilon]$:

$$\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s=\frac{1}{\varepsilon^\beta}X^\varepsilon_{t+\varepsilon^{2\beta}s},\quad s\in(0,T^\varepsilon].$$

The dynamics of $\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}$ is given by

$$\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s = \widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_0 - \int_0^s \widetilde{b}^{\varepsilon,t}_\nu d\nu - \int_0^s \sqrt{\widetilde{a}^{\varepsilon,t}_\nu} d\widetilde{W}^{\varepsilon,t}_\nu + \int_0^s \widetilde{u}^{\varepsilon,t}_\nu d\nu + \sum_{0<\widetilde{\tau}^{\varepsilon,t}_j \le s} \widetilde{\xi}^\varepsilon_j,$$

with $(\widetilde{W}^{\varepsilon,t}_s)$ Brownian motion w.r.t. $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^{\varepsilon,t}_s = \mathcal{F}_{t+\varepsilon^{2\beta}s}$,

$$\widetilde{b}^{\varepsilon,t}_s = \varepsilon^\beta b_{t+\varepsilon^{2\beta}s}, \quad \widetilde{a}^{\varepsilon,t}_s = a_{t+\varepsilon^{2\beta}s},$$

and

$$\widetilde{u}^{\varepsilon,t}_s = \varepsilon^\beta u^\varepsilon_{t+\varepsilon^{2\beta}s}, \quad \widetilde{\xi}^\varepsilon_j = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^\beta}\xi^\varepsilon_j, \quad \widetilde{\tau}^{\varepsilon,t}_j = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2\beta}}(\tau^\varepsilon_j - t) \vee 0.$$

The corresponding local cost is defined by

$$I^\varepsilon_t = \frac{1}{T^\varepsilon}\Big(\int_0^{T^\varepsilon} (r_t D(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s) + l_t Q(\widetilde{u}^{\varepsilon,t}_s))ds + \sum_{0<\widetilde{\tau}^{\varepsilon,t}_j \le T^\varepsilon} (k_t F(\widetilde{\xi}^\varepsilon_j) + h_t P(\widetilde{\xi}^\varepsilon_j))\Big).$$

Thanks to the following lemma, proven in [2, Section 6] , to characterize the asymptotic behavior of the cost functional, it is enough to study the local cost.

Lemma 4.1. *We have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{\zeta_D \beta}} J^\varepsilon = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int_0^T I^\varepsilon_t dt, \quad a.s.,$$

if the term on the right hand side exists.

Moreover, up to a localization procedure, we can assume that $U^g_t = \{(x, U_t(x)), x \in G_t\}$ is contained in a bounded ball of $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, and there exist positive constants δ and M such that $\delta < V(\xi_t(x)) - V(x)$, $x \in \partial G_t$, $V(x) < M$, $x \in G_t$, and moreover

$$\|a_t(\omega)\| \vee r_t(\omega)^{\pm 1} \vee l_t(\omega)^{\pm 1} \vee h_t(\omega)^{\pm 1} \vee k_t(\omega)^{\pm 1} < M$$

for any (t, ω). Finally, since we are interested in convergence in probability we may assume that X° is a martingale, that is, $b_t \equiv 0$.

Define random measures $(\mu^\varepsilon_t, \rho^\varepsilon_t)$ by

$$\mu^\varepsilon_t = \frac{1}{T^\varepsilon}\int_0^{T^\varepsilon} \delta_{\{(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s, \widetilde{u}^{\varepsilon,t}_s)\}} ds \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d),$$
$$\rho^\varepsilon_t = \frac{1}{T^\varepsilon}\sum_{0<\widetilde{\tau}^{\varepsilon,t}_j \le T^\varepsilon} \delta_{\{(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_{\widetilde{\tau}^{\varepsilon,t}_j -}, \widetilde{\xi}^\varepsilon_j)\}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)),$$

and $c : \Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$c_t(\omega, \mu, \rho) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (r_t(\omega)D(x) + l_t(\omega)Q(u))\mu(dx \times du)$$
$$+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} (k_t(\omega)F(\xi) + h_t(\omega)P(\xi))\rho(dx \times d\xi).$$

Then $(\mu^\varepsilon, \rho^\varepsilon)$ is a sequence of stochastic processes with values in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and

$$\int_0^T I^\varepsilon_t dt = \int_0^T c_t(\mu^\varepsilon_t, \rho^\varepsilon_t)dt.$$

Let $(\pi_t, \nu_t) := (\pi^{(a_t, U_t, G_t, \xi_t)}, \nu^{(a_t, U_t, G_t, \xi_t)})$ be the process uniquely determined by (2.5), and put

$$\mu_t(dx \times du) = \pi_t(dx) \otimes \delta_{U(x)}(du), \quad \rho_t(dx \times d\xi) = \nu_t(dx) \otimes \delta_{\xi(x)}(d\xi).$$

Then we have to show

$$\int_0^T c_t(\mu^\varepsilon_t, \rho^\varepsilon_t)dt \to_p \int_0^T c_t(\mu_t, \rho_t)dt. \tag{4.1}$$

In view of Appendix 5, it suffices to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *1. For any $t \in [0,T)$, $(\mu_t^\varepsilon, \rho_t^\varepsilon)$ converges in probability to (μ_t, ρ_t).*

2. The sequence $\{(\mu_t^\varepsilon, \rho_t^\varepsilon)_{t\in[0,T]}, \varepsilon > 0\}$ of measure valued stochastic processes is weakly tight with respect to the cost functional c (see Definition 5.2).

Proof. We claim first that

$$\sup_{\varepsilon>0} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\frac{N^\varepsilon_{T^\varepsilon}}{T^\varepsilon}\Big)^k\Big] < \infty, \quad k = 1, 2, \tag{4.2}$$

Indeed, by Ito formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{N^\varepsilon_{T^\varepsilon}}{T^\varepsilon} &\le \frac{1}{T^\varepsilon}\sum_{j=1}^{N^\varepsilon_{T^\varepsilon}} \delta^{-1}(V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_{\widetilde{\tau}^\varepsilon_j -}) - V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_{\widetilde{\tau}^\varepsilon_j})) \\
&= \delta^{-1}\frac{1}{T^\varepsilon}\Big[- V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_{T^\varepsilon}) + V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_{0+}) - \int_0^{T^\varepsilon} \nabla V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s)^T \sqrt{\widetilde{a}^{\varepsilon,t}_s} d\widetilde{W}^{\varepsilon,t}_s \\
&\quad + \int_0^{T^\varepsilon} \sum_i \widetilde{u}^{\varepsilon,t}_{i,s} \partial_i V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s) ds + \int_0^{T^\varepsilon} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{ij} \widetilde{a}^{\varepsilon,t}_{ij,s} \partial^2_{ij} V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s) ds\Big] \\
&\le \frac{M}{\delta}\Big(const. - \int_0^{T^\varepsilon} \nabla V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s)^T \sqrt{\widetilde{a}^{\varepsilon,t}_s} d\widetilde{W}^{\varepsilon,t}_s\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

the last term being obviously square-integrable after the localization procedure. Now we are ready to prove the two claims.

Convergence in probability. By (4.2) and localization, for any $t \in [0,T)$ fixed, the family $\{(\mu_t^\varepsilon, \rho_t^\varepsilon), \varepsilon > 0\}$ is tight. Let $\mathbb{Q}_t$ be any stable limit of $(\mu_t^\varepsilon, \rho_t^\varepsilon)$. Since

$$c_t(\mu_t^\varepsilon, \rho_t^\varepsilon) \le M(1 + \frac{N^\varepsilon_{T^\varepsilon}}{T^\varepsilon}),$$

we have $\sup_\varepsilon \mathbb{E}[c_t(\mu_t^\varepsilon, \rho_t^\varepsilon)] < \infty$ in view of (4.2) with $k = 1$. Then by Lemma 6.3 in [2], we have $\mathbb{Q}_t^\omega$-a.e.,

$$(\mu, \rho) \in S(a_t(\omega)),$$

where we recall that $S(a)$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
S(a) = \Big\{ &(\mu, \bar\rho) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathcal{M}(\overline{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0_\xi\}}), \\
&\bar\rho = \rho + \theta_{\bar\rho}\delta_\infty \text{ with } \rho \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0_\xi\}), \\
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} A^a f(x,u)\mu(dx,du) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\{0_\xi\}} Bf(x,\xi)\rho(dx,d\xi) = 0, \forall f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d)\Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, let F^ω_μ and F^ω_ρ be given by

$$F^\omega_\mu = \{(x, U^\omega_t(x)) | x \in G^\omega_t\}, \quad F^\omega_\rho = \{(x, \xi^\omega_t(x)) | x \in \partial G^\omega_t\}.$$

By the continuity of (G_t, ξ_t), $\mathbb{Q}_t^\omega$-a.e., (μ, ρ) is supported on F^ω_μ and F^ω_ρ respectively. By the separability (2.5) of (G_t, ξ_t), such couple of (μ, ρ) is unique, so we have

$$\mathbb{Q}_t = \mathbb{P}(d\omega) \otimes \delta_{\{(\mu^{(a_t, U_t, G_t, \xi_t)(\omega)}, \rho^{(a_t(\cdot, U_t, G_t, \xi_t)(\omega))}\}}.$$

which is the unique possible limit point and we deduce that convergence in probability holds.

Weak tightness of $(\mu^\varepsilon, \rho^\varepsilon)$ with respect to c. In view of (4.2) with $k = 2$, the application $(t, \omega) \mapsto c_t(\omega, \mu_t^\varepsilon(\omega), \rho_t^\varepsilon(\omega))$ is uniformly square-integrable w.r.t. $\mathbb{P} \otimes dt$, hence uniformly integrable. By Lemma 2 of [3] and the remark after it, $(\mu^\varepsilon, \rho^\varepsilon)$ is weakly tight w.r.t. c. ∎

Proof of Theorem 3.1 The proof is the same as Theorem 2.1 with (4.2) replaced by

$$\sup_{\varepsilon>0}\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\frac{\widetilde{\varphi}^{\varepsilon}_{T^\varepsilon}}{T^\varepsilon}\Big)^k\Big]<\infty,\quad k=1,2,$$

which can be obtained by applying Itō formula to $V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon}_{T^\varepsilon})$:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\widetilde{\varphi}^{\varepsilon}_{T^\varepsilon}}{T^\varepsilon}&\le\frac{1}{T^\varepsilon}\int_0^{T^\varepsilon}\delta^{-1}[-\widetilde{\gamma}^{\varepsilon}_t\cdot\nabla V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s)]d\widetilde{\varphi}^{\varepsilon}_t\\&=\delta^{-1}\frac{1}{T^\varepsilon}\Big[-V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_{T^\varepsilon})+V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_{0+})+\int_0^{T^\varepsilon}\nabla V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s)\cdot\sqrt{\widetilde{a}^{\varepsilon,t}_s}d\widetilde{W}^{\varepsilon,t}_s\\&\quad+\int_0^{T^\varepsilon}\sum_i\widetilde{u}^{\varepsilon,t}_{i,s}\partial_iV(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s)ds+\int_0^{T^\varepsilon}\frac{1}{2}\sum_{ij}\widetilde{a}^{\varepsilon,t}_{ij,s}\partial^2_{ij}V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s)ds\Big]\\&\le\frac{M}{\delta}\Big(const.+\int_0^{T^\varepsilon}\nabla V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s)^T\sqrt{\widetilde{a}^{\varepsilon,t}_s}d\widetilde{W}^{\varepsilon,t}_s\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 3.2 The rescaled process $(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s)$ is given by

$$d\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s=\widetilde{b}^{\varepsilon,t}_sds+\sqrt{\widetilde{a}^{\varepsilon,t}_s}d\widetilde{W}^{\varepsilon,t}_s+\widetilde{u}^{\varepsilon,t}_sds,$$

with

$$\widetilde{b}^{\varepsilon,t}_s=\varepsilon^{\beta}_{t+\varepsilon^{2\beta}s},\quad\widetilde{a}^{\varepsilon,t}_s=a_{t+\varepsilon^{2\beta s}},\quad\widetilde{u}^{\varepsilon,t}_s=\varepsilon^{(2-1)\beta}u^{\varepsilon}_{t+\varepsilon^{2\beta}s}.$$

The empirical occupation measure μ^{ε}_t is defined by

$$\mu^{\varepsilon}_t=\frac{1}{T^\varepsilon}\int_0^{T^\varepsilon}\delta_{\{(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s,\widetilde{u}^{\varepsilon,t}_s)\}}ds.$$

The proof is slightly different since X^ε is not constrained inside a uniformly bounded domain G_t as before.

Up to a localization procedure, we can assume that there exist $\theta,\Theta>0$ such that

$$(A^{a_t}+U_t(x)\cdot\nabla)V(x)\le\theta-2\Theta V(x),\quad x\in\mathbb{R}^d.$$

We follow [1, Lemma 2.5.5] and obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s)\right]\le\frac{\theta}{2\Theta}+V(0),\quad\forall t\in[0,T),s\in(0,T^\varepsilon].\tag{4.3}$$

Let π^{ε}_t be the marginal of μ^{ε}_t on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Since $rD+lQ\circ U_t\le V$ near infinity, the empirical costs $\{c_t(\mu^{\varepsilon}_t)\}$ are bounded by $\int(b_0+b_1V(x))d\pi^{\varepsilon}_t$. By (4.3), we have

$$\sup_{\varepsilon}\mathbb{E}[c_t(\mu^{\varepsilon}_t)]\le\sup_{\varepsilon}\mathbb{E}[\int(b_0+b_1V(x))d\pi^{\varepsilon}_t]=b_0+b_1\frac{1}{T^\varepsilon}\int_0^{T^\varepsilon}\mathbb{E}[V(\widetilde{X}^{\varepsilon,t}_s)]ds<\infty.\tag{4.4}$$

Convergence in probability. Since U_t is admissible, U_t sends compact sets into compact sets, the tightness of μ^{ε}_t follows directly from the tightness of π^{ε}_t. By (4.4) we can apply Lemma 6.3 in [2] and the convergence in probability follows from the separability of π w.r.t. A^a_u.

Weak tightness. For any $t\in[0,T)$ and $\varepsilon>0$, we have that (4.4) holds for a sufficiently large constant. Since $c_t(\mu^{\varepsilon}_t)\to_p c_t(\mu_t)$, we have by Fubini theorem and dominated convergence theorem

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to0}\int c_t(\mu^{\varepsilon}_t)dt\otimes d\mathbb{P}=\int c_t(\mu_t)dt\otimes d\mathbb{P}<\infty.$$

By [3, Lemma 3], we obtain the weak tightness.

5 Convergence of integral functionals

In this section, we provide a direct generalization of the result in [3], which allows us to pass from the convergence of local systems (Lemma 4.2) to the convergence of cost integrals (4.1).

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, $(T, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ a σ-finite measure space and S a Polish space with Borel σ-field $\mathcal{B}_S = \mathcal{B}(S)$, $C(S)(C_b(S))$ the space of continuous (bounded continuous) real-valued functions on S, $\mathcal{L}_1(\mu) := \mathcal{L}_1(T, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ the space of integrable real-valued functions with seminorm $\|x\|_1 := \int_T |x_t| \mu(dt)$ and $L_1(\mu) := L_1(T, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ the corresponding Banach space.

Now let $c : \Omega \times T \times S \to \mathbb{R}$ be a $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{B}_S$-measurable function with $c_t(\omega, \cdot) \in C(S)$ for all $t \in T$. Let $\{X^n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a sequence of $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}/\mathcal{B}_S$-measurable functions $X^n : \Omega \times T \to S$ with

$$\int_T |c_t(\omega, X_t^n(\omega))| \mu(dt) < +\infty, \quad \omega \in \Omega, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then the random integral $I(X^n, c)$ is defined by

$$I(X^n, c) := \int_T c_t(X_t^n) \mu(dt).$$

Note that the map $(\omega, t) \mapsto X_t^{n,c}(\omega) := c_t(\omega, X_t^n(\omega))$ is $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}$-measurable. For all $\omega \in \Omega$, $\hat{X}^{n,c} := X^{n,c}(\omega)$ is an element of $L_1(\mu)$ and $\omega \mapsto \hat{X}^{n,c}(\omega)$ is $\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{B}(L_1(\mu))$-measurable (see [3]).

Definition 5.1. *The processes X^n converges to X^0 in probability in finite dimension if there is $T_0 \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\mu(T \setminus T_0) = 0$ such that for any $t_1, \cdots, t_k \in T_0$, $(X_{t_1}^n, \cdots, X_{t_k}^n)$ converges to $(X_{t_1}^0, \cdots, X_{t_k}^0)$ in probability.*

Definition 5.2. *A sequence $\{X^n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of measurable processes is called weakly tight with respect to c if for each $\delta > 0$, there is $K \subset L_1(\mu)$ weakly compact, that is compact in the $\sigma(L_1(\mu), L_\infty(\mu))$-topology, such that*

$$\inf_n \mathbb{P}[\hat{X}^{n,c} \in K] > 1 - \delta.$$

In particular, the family X^n is weakly tight with respect to c if one of the following condition holds:

1. The family of r.v. $\{(\omega, t) \mapsto c_t(\omega, X_t^n(\omega)), n \in \mathbb{N}^*\}$ is $\mathbb{P} \otimes \mu$-uniformly integrable, see [3, Lemma 2].
2. X^n converges weakly to X^0 in finite dimension and

$$\limsup_n \int c_t(X_t^n) dt \otimes d\mathbb{P} \leq \int c_t(X_t^0) dt \otimes d\mathbb{P} < \infty.$$

   See [3, Lemma 3].

Now we can state our result concerning the convergence in probability of the random variables $I(X^n, c)$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\{X^n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a sequence of stochastic process. If X^n converges to X^0 in probability in finite dimension and if $\{X^n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is weakly tight w.r.t. c, then $I(X^n, c)$ converges to $I(X^0, c)$ in probability.*

Proof. After Lemma D.1 in [2], it suffices to show that $I(X^n, c)$ converges stably to $I(X^0, c)$. Let Y be any bounded r.v. and f bounded continuous and Lipschitz. We will show that

$$\mathbb{E}[Y f(I(X^n, c))] \to \mathbb{E}[Y f(I(X^0, c))], \quad n \to \infty. \tag{5.1}$$

Step i.) Let $h \in \mathcal{L}_1^+(\mu)$. Define

$$c_t^h(\omega, x) := \max\{-h_t, \min\{h_t, c_t(\omega, x)\}\},$$

and

$$I(X^n, c^h) := \int_T c_t^h(X_t^n) \mu(dt), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We show that $I(X^n, c^h)$ converges stably to $I(X^0, c^h)$, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}[Y f(I(X^n, c^h)] \to \mathbb{E}[Y f(I(X^0, c^h)], \quad n \to \infty. \tag{5.2}$$

Since $|I(X^n, c^h)| \leq \|h\|_1$ and polynomials are dense in $C([-\|h\|_1, \|h\|_1])$, we only need to consider $f(x) = x^l$ for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$. By Fubini's theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[Yf(I(X^n, c^h))] &= \int_\Omega Y(\omega)\Big(\int_T c^h_{t_1}(\omega, X^n_{t_1})\mu(dt_1)\cdots\int_T Y(\omega)c^h_{t_l}(\omega, X^n_{t_l})\mu(dt_l)\Big)\mathbb{P}(d\omega)\\ &= \int\cdots\int F_n(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\mu(dt_1)\cdots\mu(dt_l)\end{aligned}$$

where

$$F_n(t_1,\cdots,t_l) := \int_\Omega Y(\omega)c^h_{t_1}(\omega, X^n_{t_1})\cdots c^h_{t_l}(\omega, X^n_{t_l})\mathbb{P}(d\omega).$$

By weak convergence and the finite dimensional convergence in probability of X^n, we have $F_n(t_1,\cdots,t_l) \to F_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l)$ for any $t_1,\cdots,t_l \in T_0$. Since

$$F_n(t_1,\cdots,t_l) \leq (\sup_\omega |Y|)h(t_1)\cdots h(t_l),$$

we have

$$\int\cdots\int F_n(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\mu(dt_1)\cdots\mu(dt_l) \to \int\cdots\int F_0(t_1,\cdots,t_l)\mu(dt_1)\cdots\mu(dt_l),$$

by dominated convergence, whence (5.1).

Step ii.) By [3, Remark 1] and the weak tightness of X^n w.r.t. c, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ there is a weakly compact set K_N of $L_1(\mu)$ and $h_N \in \mathcal{L}^+_1(\mu)$ such that

$$\inf_n \mathbb{P}[\hat{X}^{n,c} \in K_N] \geq 1 - \frac{1}{N}, \tag{5.3}$$

and

$$\sup_{x\in K_N}\int_T (|x| - h_N)^+ d\mu \leq \frac{1}{N}. \tag{5.4}$$

We can assume w.l.o.g that $h_N \uparrow \infty$ for $N \uparrow \infty$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathbb{E}[Yf(I(X^n,c))] - \mathbb{E}[Yf(I(X^0,c))]| &\leq |\mathbb{E}[Yf(I(X^n,c))] - \mathbb{E}[Yf(I(X^n,c^{h_N}))]|\\ &\quad + |\mathbb{E}[Yf(I(X^n,c^{h_N}))] - \mathbb{E}[Yf(I(X^0,c^{h_N}))]|\\ &\quad + |\mathbb{E}[Yf(I(X^0,c^{h_N}))] - \mathbb{E}[Yf(I(X^0,c))]|\\ &=: e_1 + e_2 + e_3.\end{aligned}$$

Since Y is bounded and f is bounded Lipschitz, we have

$$\begin{aligned}e_1 &\leq (\sup_\omega |Y|)(2(\sup_x |f|)\mathbb{P}[|I(X^n,c) - I(X^n,c^{h_N})| \geq \frac{1}{N}] + \mathrm{Lip}(f)\frac{1}{N})\\ &\leq const.\frac{1}{N},\end{aligned}$$

where the constant is independent of n. Here we use (5.3), (5.4) and

$$\begin{aligned}|I(X^n,c^{h_N}) - I(X^n,c)| &\leq \int_T |c^{h_N}_t(X^n_t) - c_t(X^n_t)|\mu(dt)\\ &= \int_T (|c_t(X^n_t)| - h_N(t))^+\mu(dt).\end{aligned}$$

Hence $e_1 < \varepsilon$ for N large enough. By dominated convergence, $I(X^0, c^{h_N}) \to I(X^0, c)$ pointwise, hence $e_3 < \varepsilon$ for N large enough. Now fix N, by (5.2), we have $e_2 < \varepsilon$ for n large enough. In sum, we have $|\mathbb{E}[Yf(I(X^n,c))] - \mathbb{E}[Yf(I(X^0,c))]| \leq 3\varepsilon$ for n large enough. Since ε is arbitrary, (5.1) follows and we can conclude. □

References

[1] A. Arapostathis, V. S. Borkar, and M. K. Ghosh, *Ergodic control of diffusion processes*, no. 143, Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[2] J. Cai, M. Rosenbaum, and P. Tankov, *Asymptotic lower bounds for optimal tracking: a linear programming approach*. Arxiv preprint, 2015.

[3] H. Cremers and D. Kadelka, *On weak convergence of integral functionals of stochastic processes with applications to processes taking paths in* $\{LEP\}$, Stochastic processes and their applications, 21 (1986), pp. 305–317.

[4] M. I. Freidlin, *Functional Integration and Partial Differential Equations*, Annals of Mathematics Studies 109, Princeton University Press, 1985.

[5] E. Gobet and N. Landon, *Almost sure optimal hedging strategy*, The Annals of Applied Probability, 24 (2014), pp. 1652–1690.

[6] M. Kisielewicz, *Stochastic Differential Inclusions and Applications*, Springer, 2013.

[7] T. G. Kurtz and R. H. Stockbridge, *Stationary solutions and forward equations for controlled and singular martingale problems*, Electronic Journal of Probability, 6 (2001), pp. 1–52.

[8] O. A. Ladyzhenskaya and N. N. Ural'tseva, *Linear and quasilinear elliptic equations*, Academic Press, 1968.

[9] K. Nyström and T. Önskog, *The Skorohod oblique reflection problem in time-dependent domains*, The Annals of Probability, 38 (2010), pp. 2170–2223.

[10] P. E. Protter, *Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations*, Springer, 2nd ed., 2004.

[11] L. Słomiński and T. Wojciechowski, *Stochastic differential equations with time-dependent reflecting barriers*, Stochastics An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes, 85 (2013), pp. 27–47.

[12] D. W. Stroock and S. Varadhan, *Diffusion processes with boundary conditions*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics, 24 (1971), pp. 147–225.

[13] R. L. Tweedie, *Sufficient conditions for ergodicity and recurrence of Markov chains on a general state space*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 3 (1975), pp. 385–403.